

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-54 and 62-64 are presently active; Claims 55-61 and 65 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure that was non-enabling. Claim 1 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,501. Claim 1 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,507. Claim 1 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,138. Claim 1 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,467. Claims 1-11, 13-14, 17-19, 21-27, 28-32, 33-38, 40-41, 44-46, 48-54, 55-57 and 60-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonderman et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,802,045) in view of Jain et al ("Mathematical Physical Engine: Parallel Processing for Modeling and Simulation of Physical Phenomena"). Claims 12, 15-16, 20, 39, 42-43, 47, and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Sonderman et al in view of Jain et al and Chen (U.S. Pat. No. 5,719,796).

Entry of Amendment: The present amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 which after final rejection permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, or presenting


amendments touching on the merits upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the amendment is necessary and was not presented earlier. The present amendment cancels Claims 55-61 and 65 to simplify the appeal. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

A Notice of Appeal is filed herewith. A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith eliminating the non-statutory double patenting rejection.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouck
Registration No. 32,829
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
EDG:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\230420US\RESPONSE DUE 9-2-08.DOC